DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 708 IR 006 087

AUTHOR Fuller, Muriel L.
TITLE Illinois State Library Shared Staffing Program Policy Review. Phase I: Report.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Library, Springfield.
PUB DATE 30 Nov 77
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Inservice Programs; *Librarians; *Library Programs; Professional Training; Program Evaluation; *Public Libraries; *Shared Services

ABSTRACT

The Shared Staffing Program in Illinois began in 1975 under co-operative funding from the Illinois State Library, the public library systems, and local libraries. By 1977 fifteen public libraries in three systems were involved in seven projects, each funded for three years. The original objective was to provide beginning professional librarians the opportunity to work in libraries serving populations of less than 10,000 that had not had professional staff members until that time. In actual practice, the persons hired did not work as the administrators of small libraries, but as staff members in reference and adult services, children's work, community service, cataloging, homebound service, and administrative services in libraries of various sizes. The program policy review resulted in a recommendation that the program continue because it was effectively increasing the numbers of professional librarians in public libraries and was based on scund principles of public library operation. (Author/JAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED158708

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY

SHARED STAFFING PROGRAM POLICY REVIEW

PHASE I: REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Muriel L. Fuller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PROFESSOR MURIEL L. FULLER
1347 NORTH WINGRA DRIVE
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53715

IR006087

ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY

SHARED STAFFING PROJECT REVEIW REPORT

At its June, 1977 meeting the Illinois State Library Advisory Committee requested that the Shared Staffing Program be reviewed and that a proposal for suggested changes in the guidelines and in the program be submitted for consideration at its June, 1978 meeting.

Two phases for the study were outlined. In Phase I the seven programs in operation would be reviewed and evaluated and recommendations based on the evaluation be submitted to the Advisory Committee. Phase I should be completed by December, 1977. In Phase II the personnel needs of libraries serving populations under ten thousand, which represent over seventy percent of the libraries in the state, would be reviewed and studied with the purpose of suggesting modifications in the present Shared Staffing Program which would meet those needs more adequately and also to recommend similar or alternative programs geared to this population group. The suggestions would be considered for inclusion in the Illinois State Library Manpower Development Program.

PHASE I: REPORT

1. Methods
2. General Summary
3. Summary of questionnaires
4. Recommendations
5. Appendixes

Note: On December 1, 1977, the Shared Staffing Programs has:
2 projects operating in the third year
2 projects operating in the first year
2 projects just beginning operation
1 project without a shared staffer.

PHASE I: REPORT
1. METHODS

A consultant, Muriel L. Fuller. retired professor of Library Science, University of Wisconsin, Madison agreed to carry out the review of the Shared Staffing Program in cooperation with the Illinois State Library and to prepare the report with recommendations for both Phase I and II and submit them to the Illinois State Library Advisory Committee.

In addition to reviewing the proposals and reports for the six programs now in operation and the seventh, which will be as soon as the Shared Staffer is employed, meetings were held at the headquarters of DuPage, Suburban and Shawnee Library Systems with the local librarians, shared staffers, system liaisons and the State Library consultant attending. At the meetings the programs were discussed in great detail and problems and results thoroughly aired. Impressions of great variance in objectives and activities were reinforced by a field visit to all public libraries involved.

A questionnaire asking for in-put from each person who had been involved in the projects from the beginning to the present was sent and very helpful replies were received from all the librarians involved now.

The intent of the questionnarie was to elicit responses to questions about process, to ask for suggestions for improvement in the guidelines and changes in the program itself, and whether the Shared Staffing Program should continue as a part of the State Library's Manpower Development Program. The response to the last question was very nearly a unanimous and resounding "yes".

The report on Phase I based on the information gained in the ways outlined has been prepared with recommendations and is being submitted to the State Library Advisory Committee at their December, 1977 meeting.

2. GENERAL SUMMARY

In 1975 the Shared Staffing Program was introduced to Illinois libraries. It was designed to provide a way to meet the need for professional library leadership in a number of the libraries serving populations of 10,000 or less which included seventy percent of the public libraries in the state. It would also provide young professional graduates with leadership and administrative experience. Discussion of the program indicated that another benefit which hopefully would result would be the cooperative working and planning together of libraries so that they could really benefit from having professional leadership and obtain a new concept of what full library service might be.

In the planning and carrying out of the program the local libraries would work with a system liaison person and a State Library staff member in order to design programs which would result in helping the libraries meet the objectives stated in the program.

The objectives were:

1. To improve the quality of library service in communities now unable to afford professional staff;

2. To assist libraries in the process of meeting minimum standards by offering incentive through special personnel grants;

3. To establish a basis for cooperative effort with long range potential for developing larger units of library service;

4. To help meet objectives of the State Long Range Plan.

The original concept of shared staffing was to make it possible for two libraries, each serving up to 10,000 population to share a professional librarian as their administrator in order to help them accomplish the goal of providing more adequate library service in their communities. In addition there was the expectation that working together would demonstrate the advantage of cooperation between libraries which might lead to further cooperative programs and services being provided jointly.

The concept of shared staffing is a logical administrative principle that libraries are beginning to accept. In most instances a single position is shared by two persons. The Illinois State Library has offered a unique variation which has great potential for long range improvement of Illinois library service through increased numbers of professional staff. However, certain changes in the Shared Staffing Program appear essential in order to realize its potential.

Although priority in the original proposal was to be given to libraries in rural areas and to libraries serving populations under 10,000, three years of programming have shown very practical reasons why there has been no rush of applicants from that sector.

Finding two libraries near enough geographically to make shared staffing feasible and having these libraries at the same stage of development so they can plan ahead to take on the full funding for the half-time position in three years at a professional salary rate is very difficult especially for public libraries in areas where present funding for public library service is apt to be minimal. Suggesting that the shared staffer might be a beginning professional who would gain valuable administrative experience by working in two libraries as the director raises an almost unattainable expectation of the capability of the recent library school graduate. Learning to cope with all the day-to-day operations of the library--and in two of them at the same time(!)--as well as working with the library trustees, the governmental officials, system personnel and the community at large is a very demanding job. It is difficult enough for the mature person with great judgment and administrative skill to work through the first year of responsibility in one library. Two libraries would be impossible to handle except for the experienced administrator who might see a challenge in developing two programs simultaneously. In that case though, the salary which the libraries could afford would not compensate for the experience the person would bring to the position.

However, as one of the shared staffers stated in his comments on his position as a recent graduate without experience, the shared staffing position can be an ideal situation. As he said, "Though the shared staffing position was originally designed to place professional directors in small libraries that otherwise could not afford the benefit of a director with a library science degree, in practice the program has put new librarians in professional positions at a level below that of director--as reference or children's librarian. It's these positions which are great for the new librarians fresh out of library school."

Another aspect of the program which needs to be re-considered is the assumption that each public library serving a population under 10,000 should have professionally trained leadership. When is it economically and professionally feasible to expect a public library to seek and hire a professional librarian? 5,000 population? 8,000? 10,000? If a population standard were accepted as a guideline then the libraries could easily be identified which do not have a professionally trained librarian on the staff, and a more specific program could be designed to help them reach the goal in the next five to ten years. Shared staffing might be one method to be proposed but there should be alternatives.

If the population figure of 5,000-10,000 were used in the guidelines, then a study of the public library statistics (1976) shows the number of communities in the population category in each system as follows:

	Libraries	5,000-10,000		Libraries	5,000-10,000
Bur Oak	23	8	Lincoln Trail	47	2
Chicago	1	0	North Suburban	40	3
Cornbelt	21	0	Northern Illinois	55	5
Cumberland Trails	17	8	River Bend	21	3
DuPage	26	6	Rolling Prairie	30	2
Great River	22	1	Shawnee	34	10
Illinois Valley	34	3	Starved Rock	28	5
Kaskaskia	18	2	Suburban	74	16
Lewis and Clark	30	7	Western Illinois	27	2

It seemed important to find out how many libraries in this population bracket now have at least one professional staff member. A quick telephone survey of the systems gathered the following responses when the questions were asked, how many libraries in your system serve 8,000-12,000 persons? How many of these have at least one professional librarian on the staff?

Chicago was not called and responses were not available from two other systems, so fifteen systems responded. They said that they have a total of 56 libraries serving the 8,000-12,000 population group with 33 libraries being served by professional librarians. Looking at DuPage, North Suburban and Suburban together they indicated they have 30 libraries in the category with 21 professional librarians and would need 11 more professional librarians to meet the standard. In the 26 libraries in the other systems there are 12 professional librarians and a need for 14 more to meet tentative standards. Altogether there is a need for 25 additional professional librarians in that population group to have at least one professional in each library. It seems highly improbable that shared staffing under its present guidelines could help very much to fill the gap. However, the specific libraries should be queried about their plans for

having professional staff members and what assistance might help them move in that direction. A concerted effort on the part of the systems to review the present manpower programs in their libraries and to explore various long range possibilities for meeting the objectives appears to be needed.

The logical follow-up question is: what personnel needs of libraries in other population categories might the Shared Staffing Program meet? The libraries themselves have already approached that question by submitting proposals which were accepted.

The population categories of the libraries involved are:

5,000 - 9,999 - 2
10,000 - 24,999 - 9
25,000 - over - 4

The projects illustrate several patterns of cooperation among libraries of different sizes and they have been able to reach agreement on the decisions which must be made when libraries are embarking on a new pattern of operation. A possible change to be considered is to offer the program to a limited number of public libraries in large population categories which can prove a need for adding a professional staff position which they cannot fund in their present budget, but which they can justify and plan to include in the budget in four years. The same requirements for sharing the staff member with another library would apply and the same benefits accrue from the cooperative programs.

At this time the Shared Staffing Program is just getting started in Illinois but the evidence seems to show that the State Library should continue the program for at least three-five more years under revised guidelines and with a maximum of five programs each year. The result would mean an additional 15 to 25 professional librarians working in Illinois Public Libraries at an estimated cost to the State Library of $20,000 per program or $300,000 to $500,000 over a three to five year period.

Four questions were raised in the outline prepared for the Shared Staffing Policy Review which should be answered, though briefly at this time.

1. Have the present programs met their proposed objectives?

It is premature to answer this question except partially for the two programs initially funded in 1975 in the DuPage Library System.

These two projects, in their third year and both with rather recently appointed new shared staffers, had well defined objectives, carefully outlined programs, regular reporting of activities with a real effort at evaluation in terms of the objectives and very cooperative library staffs and boards. The proposal showed the results of careful joint planning from the beginning with system personnel and the state library consultant assigned to the program.

There is positive documented evidence, particularly in the cooperative reference program that the original objectives are being met and that the program will continue. Although in the Tri-City Homebound Project, one library may decide not to continue to participate in the cooperative program

after the three years are completed, the major objectives of that project will have been met also, and there is a real possibility that two of the libraries will continue to work together. They may well have demonstrated that the more effective programs will include only two libraries, not three.

One exciting result of the cooperative reference program which was not emphasized in the objectives but which is one of the most valuable outcomes has been the benefits to the library staff members in the two libraries. Planned, practical in-service training had been included as an element and has been carefully carried out. In addition, there has been exchange of staff members between the two libraries and regular joint staff meetings. There has been the learning to plan together for greater use of resources in the two libraries and in the System and the beginning of discussion of additional ways in which the two libraries may cooperate in order to improve library service in both communities.

Ideally any new proposal should include plans for cooperation beyond the use of one staff person, e.g., joint training programs; joint use of facilities; joint resource sharing or other such programs. Such plans will ultimately result in moving toward the major objective of improving public library service in Illinois through development of larger units of service.

2. Have effective criteria for evaluation been established by the libraries now participating?

In reviewing all the proposals, one discovers quite a variance among the plans for evaluation. Each project included monthly statistical reporting for the libraries and quarterly statistical and narrative reports for the libraries, systems and the State Library with the fourth quarterly report serving as the annual report. This amount of reporting was established in the guidelines.

Beyond this there is variation in the description of the procedures to be followed in developing the reports. In all, the Shared Staffer is responsible for the monthly reports but beyond that, depending upon the proposal, there may be in-put at different times by the librarians, library staff, system liaison, library board and/or library users in the quarterly and annual reports.

In some, evaluation of the staffer's performance, using regular personnel performance measures, is proposed as the major evaluation technique. In others, very careful questions have been designed to register and measure changes occuring as a result of the program.

When the program was announced originally, the expectation was that the State Library would provide uniform reporting and evaluation forms and procedures. As this has not yet been done, the question of what and how the State Library wanted reports and evaluations prepared has been a question for each program to tackle individually. It has resulted in much duplication of effort and probably wasted time.

Personnel in the programs have requested that the State Library assist them by providing more guidance on evaluation. It seems that approaching this matter with the assistance of the systems and the librarians and developing uniform guidelines and procedures would be a most helpful addition to the present programs and any future ones which may be funded.

As evaluation is ordinarily closely tied to measureable objectives, several of the libraries may wish to review their objectives as well as their evaluation criteria and techniques in order to more easily carry out their reporting and evaluation responsibilities. A useful approach would be to prioritize the objectives and determine the logical time when they could be met--in the first, second or third year of the project. Evaluation is the most difficult element in any program so whatever is designed and tried out in the projects will prove very useful to the libraries in Illinois and to the library profession at large.

3. Will it be possible to separate those libraries which meet the program criteria from those which do not?

In relation to the present funded programs, it will be possible to review each program at the end of each year of operation and to determine how well it is meeting the program criteria but in order to do so, the specific procedures to be used must be set up by the State Library and reviewed with the systems and libraries. At this time, no such review is included in the guidelines so it might be difficult to initiate it. However, for future projects such a review could be added to the State Library's responsibilities if it seemed necessary.

4. Should the basic program be continued as it is or should changes in objectives and guidelines be made?

From the program personnel and the systems there is strong support of the basic concept of the shared staffing program and that it should be continued as a portion of the State Library Manpower Development Program. There are suggestions for change and amplification of the guidelines but basically the objectives are sound and manageable with only one minor change indicated. That change is in objective one and consideration of the addition of the following words to it may be desirable:

or where the need for additional professional staff has been established but can be met only through cooperative shared staffing.

Suggestions for changes in the guidelines will be indicated under recommendations.

3. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES
SHARED STAFFING PROGRAMS

"Whether you are the librarian, shared staffer, system liaison or trustee, please respond to the questions which you can answer at this time. The Shared Staffing Programs are in different stages of development so respond to those topics which are applicable." (Letter mailed with questionnaire 10/26/77. See Appendix F.)

The questionnaire on the Shared Staffing Program was mailed in October to fifteen libraries and three system headquarters (DuPage, Shawnee, Suburban) and replies received from all the persons presently involved in the program. In October two programs were in their third year, two in their first year, two about to begin and one still seeking a librarian to fill the shared staffing position.

The librarians' replies, influenced by length of involvement in the projects, provided carefully considered answers and shared their personal and professional reactions to what had been happening since they became involved in the program, initiated by the State Library in 1975.

Besides describing the process of developing their proposals, they made suggestions for changes in the guidelines which they felt would make it easier for others to design project proposals, if the program continues, and described the difficulties they were experiencing in carrying out the evaluation procedures.

They were almost unanimous in their positive responses to the question whether the Shared Staffing Program should be continued as part of the State Library Manpower Development Program and gave very strong support to its continuation.

I. Proposal development

It was quite evident that the development of the proposals and the carrying out of the projects differ in each system. Whatever philosophy and operating procedures have been established between the local libraries and the system headquarters naturally were applied in developing the Shared Staffing Projects. Involvement of the system liaison in the program varied from very close contact in the day-to-day operation to what will probably be contact only when a problem arises or an interpretation of guidelines is needed. Continuing advisory and consultant responsibilities from the system and the State Library in the first projects undoubtedly added an element of strength which should be considered carefully by the others. During the projects the system liaison should serve as the link or the channel for communication between the participating libraries and the State Library.

The involvement of the State Library Consultant varied also from attendance to several planning meetings, board meetings, and discussion of the proposals before submission to the State Library to consultation by telephone only when needed.

Length of time spent on the development of the proposals varied from about a month to a year. Much of the time was spent, of course, in clarifying roles and responsibilities of the participating libraries and coming to agreement on practical aspects such as schedules, salaries, fringe benefits, and job descriptions and relating them to library standards and local and system policies. In all cases the trustees were involved from the beginning of the discussions to the official signing of the project proposals before they were sent to the State Library.

The guidelines as prepared by the State Library for the Shared Staffing Program (see Appendix B) were carefully prepared and used in all projects as the basis for decision making. The four broad objectives as stated were given minor attention in the proposals but offered a sound long-term rationale in the program.

The second portion of the guidelines is devoted to the "mechanism" of the program and required much discussion and constant interpretation from the State Library. The four parts were: (1) general points applicable to all participants (2) system responsibilities (3) library responsibilities and (4) financial support.

The Shared Staffing Program was deliberately designed to be a flexibly administered program with the State Library actively involved in a consultant and advisory role in order to provide the needed initial and on-going contact with each project. In the first three projects this advisory and consultant role was carried out as planned but in the succeeding projects, there was much less involvement of the State Library consultant and the proposal needed more re-designing and revision as a result.

Most of the questions which arose during the writing of the proposals were because of the lack of specific statements in the guidelines related to the State Library's role except for the financial responsibility and the state responsibility to receive its quarterly and annual reports from the projects.

Whatever policy and procedural requirements the State Library has established for the projects, they should be outlined specifically in the guidelines. All participants would agree that such an addition would be extremely useful. In other words there should be a section outlining the State Library's role and responsibilities.

II. Implementing the projects

Similar procedures were employed by all the libraries in recruiting and selecting the "shared staffers." Using system newsletters, the State Library newspaper advertisements, contacting the library education programs, interviewing at ILA and using word-of-mouth communication were the standard procedures followed.

However, orientation and in-service training varied considerably from project to project. Each shared staffer faced the same situation of becoming familiar immediately with the operations, policies, procedures and regulations of each library as well as learning about the library's and the project's relationship to the system and the State Library. This orientation is one of

the most demanding requirements for a recent graduate and beginning professional librarian. The orientations and the inservice training must be planned very thoughtfully and carefully. A suggestion has been made that in each project consideration be given to having the shared staffer spend the first week of the program in one library learning as much as possible about it and then spending the second week in the other library going through the same procedures. In the third week, the regular schedule would be put into operation.

Learning to work with the staff members of both libraries requires real sensitivity to inter-personal relations and to the importance of integrating the project into the on-going program of the libraries. In order to accomplish this objective, an in-service training program involving all staff members should be instituted very soon after the project begins. Having the shared staffer responsible for planning the activity in cooperation with the librarians and the system liaison would immediately show the advantage of having a new staff member and the project itself.

Using the project to lead to other cooperative efforts between the library staffs of the participating libraries will result in the growing acceptance of the importance and effectiveness of library cooperation in improving library service for the citizens in their communities.

III. Evaluation

In the guidelines the requirement was made that monthly statistical reporting be done by the shared staffer to the libraries and that quarterly narrative reports incorporating the statistics be made to the systems and to the State Library and that the fourth quarterly report be the annual report. Such reporting procedures were incorporated in all projects.

There was an expectation that the State Library would provide uniform reporting forms for the projects. When they were not made available, each project staff developed its own procedures and formats and spent a great deal of time doing so because of an uncertainty as to the State Library's specific desires.

Mention was also made of an omission in the section related to the system's role and responsibilities. No requirement was included that the system report regularly to the State Library on the projects under its jurisdiction. Adding such an item would make the reporting more uniform and complete.

In the project proposals, the plan for evaluation beyond the required reporting varied from a few sentences indicating that the evaluation would be of the personal job performance of the shared staffer rather than of the project itself, to carefully outlined questions to be answered in terms of changes in library service attributable to the project.

As in many similar programs, evaluation of results will be difficult because of the lack of base line data collected at the beginning of the projects and lack of statements of measurable objectives which could be examined at the end of each year in regular intervals such as the end of each year of the project.

Anxiety about the on-going and final evaulation of the projects must be recognized by the State Library and more assistance provided to all projects on this aspect of the program.

Recognition of the problem as experienced by several persons responding to the questionnaire and a cooperative effort to assist the librarians in solving the problem could be one of the most valuable outcomes of the Shared Staffing Program.

IV. Continuation of the project

In responding to the question about the continuation of the Shared Staffing Program, only one librarian questioned the feasibility of expecting a beginning professional librarian to be able to cope with the demands of the position with its double set of procedures plus the responsibility of reporting to two administrators. It was a realistic comment and must be considered seriously. On the other hand, the rest of the respondents were very supportive of the concept and of the potential of the seven funded programs to accomplish the objectives set up for them.

Typical comments on continuation of the Shared Staffing Program included the following:

1. "One of the best program for helping small libraries to continue work toward meeting minimum standards."

2. "Idea is excellent--one hope of giving professional service to the majority of people in Illinois."

3. "Continue! Continue! Continue the Shared Staffing Projects. I would apply again if I could find the time and if I did not mind being 'piggy' about a good thing. Both the Board and I feel this way."

4. "I think this in one of the best program extant among the SL Manpower Development Programs."

5. "Committed to continuation."

6. "Apparently a worthwhile project for a few libraries in the state that can work well together and are geographically close and culturally similar."

4. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE SHARED STAFFING PROGRAM

As the result of reviewing the original proposals of the seven Shared Staffing Projects, the data available from the libraries, the systems and the State Library, it is clearly established that the Shared Staffing Program is a sound personnel program carefully designed to meet certain professional manpower needs of a designated segment of public libraries in Illinois.

Based on the study of the available data, it is recommended:

(1) That the Shared Staffing Program be continued as a component of the Library Manpower Development Program of the Illinois State Library, but that certain revisions be considered for changing the objectives and the project guidelines.

(2) That the Shared Staffing Program be included in the State Plan for at least three more years (1978-81) with a maximum of five programs being funded each year.

(3) That the funding for the Program be continued at the same level and ratio of financial support for each project.

(4) That the State Library encourage each system, unless it has done so since 1975, to study the professional personnel needs of its libraries serving 25,000 population or less with the first group to be studied those libraries serving 5,000-12,000 and to report those needs to the State Library in order to develop a co-ordinated approach to meeting professional needs especially in relation to the Shared Staffing Program.

(5) That the Shared Staffing Program be related to the Project Plus Program wherever feasible.

(6) That the State Library Advisory Committee review for clarification the basic assumptions on which the Shared Staffing Program was developed and re-affirm or revise them.

A. BASIC CONCERNS AND RELATED QUESTIONS

In the original thinking and discussion about the Shared Staffing Program, particular concern was directed to those public libraries in the state serving populations between 5,000 and 10,000. The focus was on those libraries without professional staff and whose further development would be influenced decidedly by having better professional leadership and by the growth of larger units of service. It was expected that the program would appeal to libraries with budgets inadequate at the present time to hire a full time professional staff member but would hopefully be adequate to fill a part time professional position at least by the end of the three year demonstration.

Questions:

1. What population basis requires the hiring of a professional librarian? 5,000; 8,000; 10,000; 12,000?

2. What economic resources will assure adequate funding at the end of three years?

3. Should the program continue as a three year program? or in some cases would a two year demonstration meet the objectives?

4. Should patterns of cooperation between geographically close libraries but not meeting the 5,000-10,000 population figure be encouraged?

5. Should a maximum-size population served be established as acceptable to the program?

It was felt that the program could provide young professional graduates with leadership and library administrative experience. Because the expectation was that there would not be professional supervision for the shared staffer at the local library level, it was assumed that the system would play an important role in helping with the orientation and development of the professional competence of the shared staffer and would encourage the person to attend appropriate training programs within and outside the system. In fact funding was included to cover costs of such activities as professional staff development. Other prerequisites for professionals were recommended for inclusion in the plan such as a four weeks vacation period. Designation of a staff liaison person to work closely with the program and the staff member in a consultant and advisory capacity was strongly recommended as well as serving as the link between the local libraries and the State Library.

Questions:

1. Shall the program be used to introduce higher personnel standards than the library may have for its present staff? a move toward meeting the personnel standards in Measures for Quality?

2. If there is professional staff in the libraries, does that change the consultant and advisory responsibilities of the system liaison in the project?

In the original framework provided for the Program, the State Library Manpower consultant was to be closely involved in the development proposals and the on-going operations of the program in order to help the libraries and the systems work within the guidelines which had been deliberately designed so libraries could develop flexible programs to meet their specific needs.

The element of the program which makes it especially important to manpower development in the state is the committment by the libraries and the library boards that the position shall be developed as a professional library position with recognition of the importance of attempting to meet the personnel standards in Measures for Quality.

In other words, the program was not planned as a means for providing additional personnel in any public library nor to fund positions in a holding pattern in libraries which had little expectation of assuming the funding of the position at the end of the project.

Questions

1. How shall the role of the State Library be spelled out to ensure maximum advisory involvement in planning the projects and during the demonstrations?

2. What further evidence of committment to continuation of the professional position might be made available by the libraries in the project applications?

B. SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE GUIDELINES

(See Appendix B)

The guidelines have been set up to include: (I) Objectives (II) Mechanism of Programs (III) Table of Suggested Costs for the Libraries and Systems (IV) Priorities: Selection of Personnel Grant Requests (V) Estimate of Costs: ISL; Systems; Libraries.

I. Objectives

A. To improve the quality of library service in communities now unable to afford professional staff.

Comments: Several of the projects now include libraries which already have at least one professional staff member so the objective as stated has not been followed. However, the improvement in library service in each of the participating libraries because of the addition of a part time professional librarian can be measured and evaluated. To assure that similar evaluation procedures be followed in each project, the State Library and the system liaisons need to cooperate in the development of more adequate evaluation tools and procedures.

In view of the needs for professional library personnel which have been established by the libraries and that are being met through the shared staffing program, the wording of the objective should be expanded to make more libraries eligible for project grants.

Recommendation: To improve the quality of library service in communities now unable to afford professional staff or where the need for additional professional staff has been established but can be met only through cooperative shared staffing.

B. To assist libraries in the process of meeting minimum standards by offering incentives through special personnel grants.

Comments: In reviewing the project proposals clearly stated evidence of the specific and unique needs for improvement of library service in each community is given. In almost all the libraries, the impetus provided by having funds available for hiring a part time professional staff member is making it possible for them to move positively toward meeting minimum personnel standards. They are reviewing personnel policies in such areas as: the requirement for budgeting staff development funds, reviewing vacation allowances and salary levels and fringe benefits. There will be measurable results in the libraries involved especially if the positions initiated by the projects are combined on a permanent basis.

Recommendation: None

C. To establish a basis for cooperative effort with long range potential for developing larger units of library service.

Comments: The results of Objective C will be long range but the effect of the cumulative effort of cooperating to provide one type of library service will be the first step toward developing workable day-to-day operational relationships and recognizing that extension of complete library service will come only when library staff and boards have learned how to work together for the benefit of all and within the framework and support of the library system.

It is almost inevitable that the level of service related to the project area is going to be raised. What will be as important is how will the project affect the rest of the library's services? In the cooperative reference project now in its third year for instance, there is concrete evidence of the positive effect in both libraries beyond reference and the further benefit of looking ahead to additional areas of cooperation similar to the one in operation.

Recommendations:

1. That a more definite relationship be established between the Shared Staffing Program and the Project Plus Program where feasible in order to reinforce Objective C.
2. That in the project proposals the libraries consider and include other practical ways of cooperating beyond the service to be provided cooperatively.

D. To help meet objectives of the state long range plan.

Comments: The Shared Staffing Program is a very positive effort to help meet the long range goal which is "to insure that libraries have trained staff and informed governing boards who are competent to carry out their functions and who are sensitive to community needs."

In every project proposal the librarian and the library board had established the needs of the community which were not being met adequately and designed their proposals to insure that the addition of a part time professional staffer would help them meet the recognized need. So though the percentage of libraries involved is very small, their example will show other libraries how "to go and do likewise" for the ultimate improvement of library service in Illinois.

II. Mechanism of Program

A. General

Comments: The general parameters outlined in the guidelines are clearly stated and appear to need only minor change.

Suggestions:

1. In (3) add the following words, "but with special consideration being given to personnel standards in Measures for Quality."

2. In (5) to periodic review and revision add the words, "by the library, system liaison and the State Library Manpower Consultant."

3. Add (6): The objectives included in each project should be realistic and measurable and prioritized for the three years of the project.

4. Add number (7): If the program is not measurable meeting the objectives set up in the accepted project proposal when reviewed at the end of year one and two, there should be established a procedure for discontinuing funding for the next year.

B. System Responsibilities

Comments: The system liaison role has been interpreted differently by each system depending on the policies and relationships between systems and local libraries. Continuing supportive and cooperative participation by the system staff is essential. System committment to overall understanding of the staff development aspect of the program is extremely important.

Suggestions:

1.(2) Expand statement to: Agree to help train appointee and assist appointee develop in-service programs for the staffs of both libraries in the area of the shared staffing project.

2.(5) Add: Act as the link between the local libraries and the State Library in interpretation of the guidelines and reporting to the State Library annually on each project.

C. Library Responsibilities

Comment: The Shared Staffing Program is designed to demonstrate the value of having professional library leadership and give the library three years to incorporate the half time or full time position into its budget. It provides a mechanism for cooperative activity in one area of program and provides a basis and example for planning other cooperative activities and programs between the libraries. It gives experience in working within the structural relationship to the system as a step toward the development of larger units of service.

Suggestions:

1.(3) Revise: Agree to help in the training of the appointee and provide time and funds for attendance at system and other training programs as determined in preliminary agreement.

2.(5) Add: Include plans for cooperation on a broader base than just the use of one staff person, e.g., joint training programs; joint use of facilities, joint resource sharing or other such programs; more effective methods of staff utilization.

D. State Library Responsibilities (Insert as a new item)

Comments: The Shared Staffing Program was deliberately designed to be a flexibly administered program so the State Library Manpower Consultant was to be involved closely in the development of each proposal and to serve as an advisory consultant during the demonstration projects.

Suggestions:

1. Work with the libraries and systems in the development of the project proposals by clarifying the guidelines and to continue to serve as an advisory consultant to each funded project during its continuation.

2. Receive quarterly and annual reports from each Shared Staffing Project and respond to them with suggestions.

3. Provide reporting and evaluation forms and procedures to be used by each project.

4. Provide a statement of the state library's basic decisions on projects and standards which apply to the Shared Staffing Program.

E. (formerly D) Financial Support

Comment: no changes suggested.

III. Table of Suggested Costs

no comments or suggestions

IV. Priorities: Selection of personnel grant requests

A. Suggested ranking (no changes)

B. Other considerations

1. No change

2. No more than five grants in any one project year.

3. Appointee on system staff and payroll first two years or most feasible arrangement for all concerned.

V. Estimate of Costs -- no changes

5. APPENDIXES

Appendix A - Shared Staffing Program Policy Review Abstract

B - Shared Staffing Guidelines

C - Project Abstracts

D - Illinois Public Libraries by Population Served

E - Status of Approved/Active Shared Staffing Programs

F - Letter and Questionnaire

G. Preliminary Summary of Program Policy Review of Shared Staffing Program

ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY

SHARED STAFFING PROGRAM POLICY REVIEW

ALSTRACT

At its June meeting the Illinois State Library Advisory Committee requested a program review of the Shared Staffing Program and new guidelines for the program. To accomplish a complete review the services of Miss Muriel L. Fuller of the University of Wisconsin are to be utilized to provide a report and recommendations on the two phases of study required for a complete reply. They will include: Phase I: The presently operating programs and their evaluation with recommendations: Phase II, suggested modifications and recommendations for similar/different programs to balance the needs of libraries serving populations of under ten thousand, which represent over seventy percent of the libraries in the state.

In examining the latter group, factors such as education, appropriate funding, alternate programs will be considered. The second report on Phase II, will also incorporate integrated aspects of Phase I, in a final coordinated report for a total program. The projected cost of the program would be $6086.00.

SHARED STAFFING: GUIDELINES

I. OBJECTIVES:

A. To improve the quality of library service in communities now unable to afford professional staff;

B. To assist libraries in the process of meeting minimum standards by offering incentive through special personnel grants;

C. To establish a basis for cooperative effort with long range potential for developing larger units of library service;

D. To help meet objectives of the State Long Range Plan.

II. MECHANISM OF PROGRAM:

A. General:

1. The Illinois State Library and the appropriate system and the libraries involved will allocate funds to the support of new professional positions.

2. These positions will be supported on a descending scale by the Illinois State Library. The combined system - library share will increase at the same time. The precise breakdown of the system - library share will be determined by the agencies concerned. The final responsibility for financial support will rest with the library, unless position is permanently shared with system and library or libraries. (For percents see Financial Support, 3.)

3. Appointees must have a professional degree from an accredited library school as a minimum, and other experience and background as required by participating agencies. These qualifications should meet system and local standards for salary; benefits; vacations and training.

4. The area served by the professional must be large enough for continuing fiscal support on a permanent basis; should have a minimum population of 5,000; and the full support of the system and library boards as confirmed in a written agreement.

5. The appointee should be able to report to a representative of each library and a system liaison person. Schedule, duties and program should be clearly defined in advance, and subject to periodic review and revision.

B. System Responsibilities:

The system, in cooperation with the Illinois State Library would:

1. Concur in the level of training, experience, required; work

with library representatives on salary; training opportunities; benefits; and program plan for each of the libraries participating;

2. Agree to help train appointee;

3. Work with libraries in developing schedules and other administrative details and in developing a joint agreement on percentage of costs to be born by each organization;

4. Act as the agency for dispersal of funds and for reconciliation of conflicts in administration.

C. Library Responsibilities:

Each of the participating libraries would:

1. Provide partial support for three years in conjunction with the system, and then maintain an agreed upon minimum support until or if full support of the position would be possible;

2. Share these benefit and salary costs as participants in the program with the system and/other library/libraries;

3. Agree to help train appointee by support for attendance at system and other training programs as determined in preliminary agreement;

4. Find replacement for the position if the original appointee should leave.

D. Financial Support:

1. Salaries must be competitive with system and area salaries;

2. System and library (ies) will determine what percentage of salary, benefits and increases each will bear;

3. Overall ratios are:

	Illinois State Library	System & Libraries
1st:	60% (sixty percent)	40% (forty percent)
2nd:	50% (fifty percent)	50% (fifty percent)
3rd:	25% (twenty-five ")	75% (seventy-five ")
4th:	0% (no support)	100% (total support)

III. Table of Suggested Costs for the Libraries and System: (based on a salary of $10.000 for the position):

IV. Priorities: Selection of personnel grant requests:

A. Suggested ranking:

1. Rural libraries
2. Rural-urban/suburban libraries
3. Municipal libraries

B. Other Considerations:

1. No more than one annual grant in any system area, unless no other requests received;
2. No more than six grants for the first project year;
3. Appointee on system staff and payroll first two years; assignment to library at end of second year.

V. Estimate of Costs: ISL; Systems; Libraries, (Using Base Salary of $10,000 and showing options for two and three-library participation programs)

M.D. Quint

2/27/74

BATAVIA, GENEVA AND ST. CHARLES
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
TRI-CITY HOMEBOUND SERVICE

ABSTRACT

This proposal is for a shared staffing grant to furnish library service to those handicapped people who cannot use the library in a normal fashion. The population served by the three township libraries, Batavia, Geneva, and St. Charles, will be participants in the project. It is not possible, under existing circumstances of limited funding and separate staffing, to furnish in-depth service to those people who are either temporarily or permanently handicapped. A cooperative endeavor with supplementary funding would be beneficial to the three communities and would serve as a useful model for future programs.

DuPage Library System
1975

POPLAR CREEK AND ROSELLE LIBRARY DISTRICTS
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
COOPERATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

ABSTRACT

These two adjacent libraries are serving rapidly growing communities with increasingly sophisticated information needs. Financial constraints preclude the separate operation of specialized, in-depth, ready reference departments. This project would provide, through gradually descending Illinois State Library and DuPage Library System funding and on-going administrative support, a professional reference librarian to coordinate the staffs, resources, and programs of the two libraries. Benefits include greatly improved reference service, effective complementary subject development and use of materials, a more sophisticated use of the DuPage Library System Reference and Interlibrary Loan Department, and a model for local shared library services. The reference librarian would also expand the libraries' public relations programs and community contacts.

DuPage Library System
1975

DLS

2/75

BERKELEY AND ELMHURST
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
ADMINISTRATION/ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

ABSTRACT

Berkeley, a village library serving approximately 6,500 people, would like to employ a professional librarian as its administrator. Even if this board could hire a full-time librarian, the budget would limit them to a "beginner" whom they would probably have difficulty retaining over two or three years. Elmhurst, a city library serving about 50,000 people, has the need of administrative assistance within the librarian's office.

Both library boards have agreed to try sharing a librarian -- a head librarian for Berkeley, an administrative assistant for Elmhurst. The project would begin on a 50/50 basis, but will be reviewed year by year by both libraries. Because Elmhurst Library has established policies governing full-time professional librarians, the project librarian would be placed on Elmhurst's payroll. This project would enable Berkeley to hire someone with prior library experience and would provide the Elmhurst librarian with professional help. The project librarian would receive a broad range of experience with a heavy concentration in administrative problems, truly a position with infinite variety!

Suburban Library System
1977

BRIDGEVIEW AND SOUTH STICKNEY
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
INFORMATION SERVICES

ABSTRACT

These two adjacent libraries feel a strong need for leadership and expertise in the area of information services. Neither can afford a full-time highly experienced public librarian who can devote the entire workday to developing and coordinating information service for their library. To share such a position seems propitious at this time. Both libraries have staff members now assigned to information services who would welcome such a coordinator. This cooperative endeavor with supplementary funding would be directly beneficial to these two libraries located in Bridgeview and Burbank, Illinois, and would indirectly benefit their "publics".

Suburban Library System
1977

LA GRANGE AND LA GRANGE PARK
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
CHILDREN'S SERVICES

ABSTRACT

These two adjacent libraries serving "twin" villages each have the need for a half-time children's librarian -- one to initiate children's services, the other to bolster its present children's program. Not only would this project enable each library to have a professional librarian with previous children's experience fill the immediate need but it would also offer the opportunity to coordinate the children's program between both outlets, an expressed desire of both library boards. This cooperative endeavor with supplementary funding would be directly beneficial to these two communities and could possibly serve as a useful model for future programs.

Suburban Library Service
1977

SAUK VILLAGE AND STEGER/SOUTH CHICAGO HEIGHTS
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
CHILDREN'S SERVICES

ABSTRACT

These two library districts find themselves in the position of receiving less income in their upcoming fiscal year than they received in their present fiscal year. Sauk Village, a library district established in 1972, will come to the end of a two-year CETA grant June 30, 1977; Steger-South Chicago Heights, a project PLUS library established by referendum in 1975 will come to the end of the System's contribution to the PLUS library June 30, 1977. (Both of the libraries are presently receiving equalization aid and both are taxing at their maximum.)

Because of the supplementary incomes received at present, both libraries presently employ professional librarians as their head librarians as well as professional assistant librarians. As of July 1, neither will be able to continue the positions of assistant/children's librarian. For this reason both librarians and both boards have agreed to request Shared Staffing funds to hire a children's librarian to serve both libraries. This project would offer the opportunity to coordinate the children's program between both outlets. This cooperative endeavor would be immediately beneficial to these two districts; it may also serve as a model for future shared programs such as reference, adult services, etc., between these two districts which are physically separated at present by a two-mile strip of unincorporated area.

Suburban Library System
1977

CARBONDALE AND MARION
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT
COMMUNITY SERVICE/TECHNICAL SERVICE

ABSTRACT

A shared staffing proposal to provide a half-time community services librarian for the Carbondale Public Library and a half-time technical services librarian for the Marion Carnegie Library.

Shawnee Library System
1977

ILLINOIS PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY POPULATION SERVED

D

Public Library Systems	Libraries	Up to 1,499	1,500-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000-74,999	Over 75,000	Total
Bur Oak	23	1	6	8	4	3	1	23
Chicago	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Cornbelt	21	6	12	0	1	2		21
Cumberland Trails	17	3	4	8	2	0		17
DuPage	26	2	2	6	10	6		26
Great River	22	9	10	1	1	1		22
Illinois Valley	34	10	12	3	7	1	1	34
Kaskaskia	18	2	10	2	2	2		18
Lewis and Clark	30	3	17	7	1	2		30
Lincoln Trail	47	17	22	2	2	4		47
North Suburban	40	1	1	3	14	20	1	40
Northern Illinois	55	11	26	5	9	3	1	55
River Bend	21	7	8	3	1	2		21
Rolling Prairie	30	4	19	2	3	0	2	30
Bookmobile Stops	12							12
Shawnee	34	6	16	10	1	1		34
Starved Rock	28	10	9	5	4	0		28
Suburban	74	2	4	16	32	20		74
Western Illinois	27	10	12	2	2	1		27
Independent Libraries	7	1	1		3	2		7
Total	567	105	191	83	99	70	7	567

Information from: Illinois Libraries, November, 1976

ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY
STATUS OF APPROVED ACTIVE/SHARED STAFFING PROGRAMS

E

DATE	SYSTEMS AND LIBRARIES	POPULATION SERVED	TYPE OF POSITION	ISL FUNDING	SYSTEM FUNDING	LOCAL FUNDING 1-3 yrs., 4th yr.		TAX RATE	STAFF FTE
1975	(1) DuPage Library System								
	Poplar Creek Public Library Dist. Librarian: Marlene Deuel Shared Staffer: Anders C. Dahlgren System Liaison: Michael McCaslin	37,160	Reference Service	$18,343	$3,829	$8,058	$6,868	(.15)	11.2
	Roselle Public Library District Librarian: Beverly Pekarek	10,213				$8,058	$6,868	(.154)	5.2
1975	(2) DuPage Library System								
	Batavia Public Library District Librarian: Sarah J. Bast Shared Staffer: Susan Glad System Liaison: Richard Shurman	13,318	Outreach/ Homebound Service	$20,249	$4,546	$6,883	$5,434	(.15)	5.1
	Geneva Public Library District Librarian: Ruth S. Nicholds	10,787				$6,883	$5,434	(.20)	9.2
	St. Charles Public Library (twp) Librarian: Lois V. Miller	20,352				$6,883	$5,434	(.133)	11.7
	(3) Shawnee Library System								
	Carbondale Public Library Librarian: Charles Perdue Shared Staffer: Judy Miller System Liaison: James A. Ubel	26,857	Community Information/ Technical Service	$16,710	$3,498	$7,389	$6,292	(.144)	8.2
	Marion, Carnegie Library Librarian: Ronald D. Reed	13,176				$7,389	$6,292	(.0)	4.3
	(4) Suburban Library System								
	Berkeley Public Library Librarian/Shared Staffer: to be appointed System Liaison: Elizabeth Mueller	6,152	Administration	$21.395	$4,476	$9,443	$8,095	(.23)	2.8
	Elmhurst Public Library Librarian: Lawrence Knudsen	48,887				$9.443	$8,095	(.198)	29.3
	(5) Suburban Library System								
	Bridgeview Public Library Librarian: Joanne Wojeik Shared Staffer: Bonnie Anderson System Liaison: Elizabeth Mueller	13,495	Information Service	$20,733	$4,348	$9,194	$7,847	(.10)	7.2

DATE	SYSTEMS AND LIBRARIES	POPULATION SERVED	TYPE OF POSITION	ISL FUNDING	SYSTEM FUNDING	LOCAL FUNDING 1-3 yrs., 4th yr.		TAX RATE	STAFF FTE
	(5) Continued								
	South Stickney Public Library District Librarian: Eliza Biebek	32,047				$9,194	$7,847	(.15)	8.4
	(6) Suburban Library System								
	LaGrange Public Library District Librarian: Stephen L. Moskal Shared Staffer: Margaret Gross System Liaison: Elizabeth Mueller	17,814	Children's Services	$18,731	$3,934	$8,340	$7,219	(.229)	16.6
	LaGrange Park Public Library Dist. Librarian: Anne Duncan	15,495				$8,340	$7,219		
	(7) Suburban Library System								
	Sauk Village Public Library Dist. Librarian: Jack D. Hurwitz Shared Staffer: Gail Olson System Liaison: Elizabeth Mueller	9,956	Children's Services	$19,968	$4,191	$8,868	$7,602	(.15)	1
	Steger/South Chicago Heights Public Library District Librarian: Phyllis Woodword	14,208				$8,868	$7,602		3.4

Illinois State Library
Shared Staffing Review Project

October 26, 1977

I am writing to you in relation to the Illinois State Library Shared Staffing Review Project for two reasons. First, I want to thank you very much for spending time with Mary Quint and me so that I could get background information on your program. I appreciated that and enjoyed the visit to your library.

Second is a request that you take time to fill in the attached questionnaire and send it to me by November 7. It will give me your own very valuable comments on the program so that we have as complete a picture as possible as a basis for the report to the State Library Advisory Committee. The staff needs a preliminary report by November 18 and the Committee by December 7.

I have enclosed a stamped addressed envelope for the return. Please be frank and honest in your reply and your suggestions on continuation and/or change will be most helpful.

Sincerely,

Muriel L. Fuller
Project Consultant
1347 North Wingra Drive
Madison, WI 53715

Letter and questionnaire sent to all participants in Shared Staffing Programs.

ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY
SHARED STAFFING PROJECT REVIEW

To: Local libraries and library systems in the Shared Staffing Project

From: Muriel L. Fuller, Project Review Consultant

In order to gather the background information that will give us a sound basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the Shared Staffing Project and to get ideas and suggestions for improving it, if the Project continues, we are asking that you use the outline of topics and questions as guidelines for describing your project.

Whether you are the librarian, shared staffer, system liaison or trustee, please respond to the questions which you can answer at this time. The programs are in different stages of development so respond to those topics which are applicable. Use the questions as a basis for your responses.

We are asking you to do this immediately so we will have the benefit of your responses to include as one element in the report to the State Library and the Advisory Committee. We will not identify your library or system specifically.

Thank you very much for your help.

I. Proposal Development

In the Shared Staffing Project there have been three parties involved: local libraries, system staff and the State Library. We are interested in hearing about the process which was followed in the development of the proposal. Here are some questions which may help you review that process.

(1) What were the role and responsibilities of the local library and trustees? the Library System? the State Library?

Who initiated the idea of shared staffing in the libraries?
Who was involved in the planning of the proposal?
What difficulties had to be resolved? How long was the proposal discussed and by whom before submission?
When and how was the board involved?
How was the decision made on what position should be proposed?
What objectives were set up for the project?
How was the System liaison person involved in the proposal development?
What responsibilities did the System handle?
How was the State Library involved in the proposal development?

(2) Were the State Library's guidelines for preparing the shared staffing proposal clearly stated or not? If not, what suggestions do you have for improving them?

II. Implementing the Project

We are interested again in process and in your suggestions for changing and improving the program.

(1) Selection of staff member.

How was the job description developed? Who was involved? How was the staff member recruited? What changes would you suggest?

(2) On the job.

What process was followed in the orientation of the staff member in the two libraries? Any problems in carrying out the schedule? How resolved?

III. Evaluation

What criteria have you set up for evaluating the effectiveness of the project? Who is involved in the evaluation process? What changes do you suggest?

IV. Continuation of the Project

What follow-up or continuation do you see as a possibility for your own library or system?

What is your recommendation on continuing the Shared Staffing Project as one aspect of the State Library's Manpower Development Program?

PRELIMINARY SUMMARY
OF
PROGRAM POLICY REVIEW OF SHARED STAFFING PROGRAM

To: Illinois State Library Advisory Committee

From: Muriel L. Fuller, Consultant

In October, 1977 Phase I of the program review of the Shared Staffing Program began with a series of meetings at the headquarters of the DuPage, Shawnee and Suburban Library Systems for the personnel who are involved in the seven Shared Staffing Projects which have been funded by the Illinois State Library (1975-77). There were librarians from 14 of the 15 libraries, four shared staffers, five system liaisons, the State Library Consultant and the Program Review Consultant involved in a review of the projects. Following the system meetings a field visit was made to each library in order to meet other library staff members and to see their facilities and resources.

On October 26 a questionnaire was mailed to each person now involved in the Program. From the responses many useful comments have been incorporated in the full report on Phase I. They described the process of developing their project proposals, made suggestions for changes in the guidelines which would enable others to design proposals more easily, and described the difficulties they were having with the matter of evaluation. They expressed strong support of the continuation of the Shared Staffing Program as an extremely important element in the Manpower Development Program for public libraries in Illinois.

Because there is very limited experience with the projects at this time (two began in 1975 and the other five were funded in 1977), it is difficult to assess the real long range effectiveness of the shared staffing concept except in the two programs in the DuPage Library System which are in their third year of operation. Both of those projects appear to be meeting their objectives satisfactorily. Even without additional supporting evidence, it appears feasible to recommend serious consideration of the continuation of the Shared Staffing Program but under revised guidelines which would propose changing the emphasis from libraries serving populations under 10,000 to public libraries in other population categories which have a need for adding a professional staff position but can do so only if they can cooperate with a neighboring library in the kind of projects provided by the Shared Staffing Program. The complete report will offer more specific suggestions for the revision of the program.

If the program were continued for at least three to five more years with a maximum of five programs each year, the results might be an addition of 15-25 professional positions in the public libraries in Illinois by 1982. The cost at the present rate of State Library support would be $300,000 to $500,000.

In Phase II of the program review, the personnel needs of libraries serving populations under 10,000 will be reviewed and studied with the purpose of proposing alternative personnel programs geared specifically to this group of libraries. The entire report will be completed for the June Advisory Committee meeting.